4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16



solved as soon as peoples become fixed, in consequence of the necessity of integrating nonkindred elements into the social complex. The originally kindred groups become contaminated with extraneous elements, though still conceived as fictitious clans or tribes. When we first encounter the Slavs, they are mostly beyond the nomadic stage, and the most primitive social unit preserved among a Slavic people in historical times is the western Serbian *Zadruga*. This characteristic family community is probably, like the Indian "joint family," a remnant not merely of Slavic but of common Indo-European antiquity.

As far as we can judge from historical survivals, the basic social unit among the early Slavs was a rural community consisting of a certain number of persons of common descent, together with outsiders who acquired membership by marriage or adoption. Its head was either its senior member or an elected chief, and direction might even devolve upon a prominent widow. The chief represented the group in external relations and directed its economy, though in serious matters he was subject to the joint decision of its membership. Collectivity of goods prevailed; the whole fortune of such a unit, together with the individual earnings of its members, belonged to the group, and could not be disposed of without common consent. Membership in such groups might run as high as over a score of households. Fields, woodland, and similar landed appendages were common property, but pasturage might be particularized. Where trade and barter became matters of vital interest (as was the case very early on the Russian watercourses), primitive towns seem to have been the creation of ambitious groups who sought a convenient point for defense or trade and then proceeded to expand their possessions and influence by the acquisition (peacefully or by violence) of adjacent interesting territory. On the other hand, patriarchal relationships might persist even in these centers. Tribal complexes such as we later encounter among the Russian Slavs derived from the union of various family units with remote ties of kinship and might attain a membership of several thousand souls. The

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16



175* set up his capital at Sarai on the lower Volga, just below Stalingrad, to which for two centuries the Russian princes, who were the vassals of Tartars, traveled to make submission.

175* 166 The Tartar invasion aggravated the depopulation of the Kiev area which had begun under the Polovtsian menace. About the year 1300, even the metropolitan bishop of Kiev moved to Vladimir on the Klyazma, east of Moscow, and the remaining population took to the forests and hills. The result was a concentration of new settlements in the area immediately south of Moscow and considerable additions to the population of the western principality of Galicia-Volhynia, which became known as Little Russia, as opposed to Great Russia of the northeast. At the same time the northwestern principalities fell more and more into the hands of the rising Lithuanian state. The Galician-Volhynian principate was in a fair way to becoming an important national unit when it was devastated in 1283 by a Tartar expedition into Poland, with the result that Volhynia was taken over by the Lithuanians and Galicia by the Poles, who have held it intermittently from 1349 to the beginning of the second World War.

175* The economic results of the Tartar invasions were drastic even in the northeast. What national wealth was not destroyed by their pillage was extracted piecemeal by the process of collecting tribute. A population which had previously lived by hunting and fishing, importing its grain from the more fertile south, was now obliged to practice agriculture on com- [439] paratively unfavorable soil. A small amount of outside trade in furs, honey, and wax was maintained in order to secure silver with which to pay taxes, but domestic commerce was 175* paralyzed and did not recover till the fifteenth century. Fur- ●421 thermore, even prior to the Tartar conquest, the Russian princes, despite their mobility, had begun to acquire fixed estates and thus to become landed proprietors. This process was accelerated by the Tartar hegemony since, for one thing, it was easier to collect tribute from a prince who was fixed, and besides it was difficult to obtain grants of new domains

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16



from the Tartars if a prince lost or surrendered his previous holdings. Hence the princes came to set more store by personal estates, and since the Tartars in their own interest were unlikely to tolerate any large principalities, the resulting dismemberment of the major units produced a large number of smaller domains, or appanages, which passed on by inheritance, whether or not the holder might become prince of some other area by the tender mercies of the Tartars. At the same time, the Tartar invasions greatly increased the number of landless peasants—dispossessed or impoverished small farmers—who became tenant farmers for large landlords on a quitrent basis.

Under Tartar hegemony the princes of Vladimir maintained at least a nominal control over the neighboring principalities and were the spokesmen of the Russian princes before the Tartar khans. These functions were, at any rate, sufficiently important and lucrative to inspire some rivalry for the possession of the title. In 1367 Prince Dmitri Donskoi erected a stone kremlin, or citadel, at Moscow and endeavored to subject the neighboring princes to his will. He met with some resistance from Prince Michael of Tver, who tried to purchase Tartar approval for himself, but was later forced to become Dmitri's vassal. The conditions of vassalage were such that dependent princes were obliged to supply Dmitri, as their overlord, with military aid, and when Dmitri won his famous victory over the Tartars in 1380 (the first case of successful Russian resistance), they supported him in this way.

The decline of the Tartars, manifested by conflicts of authority in the khanate itself, had begun almost a century before, and even prior to the year 1300 there were moments when the existence of two competing khans placed the Russian princes in a quandary. The struggle for supremacy between the princes of Tver and Moscow (which first became critical shortly before the year 1300) for supremacy as holders of the title Prince of Vladimir was also fought out in this interval. The dominance of Moscow was recognized in 1327 when Prince Ivan I secured authority to farm the Tartar taxes and began to in-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs/E16



mined independently of the princes, for one can appreciate that normal life went on even when princes shifted through inheritance or dynastic quarrels.

As a matter of fact in Novgorod, which was comparatively remote from either Kiev or Vladimir-Suzdal, the resident princes were merely delegates of the dominant state which momentarily enjoyed the lordship over the northern metropolis, but these resident princes changed so often that the citizens began to choose elective burgomasters early in the twelfth century. Eventually the princes surrendered even their control of the local courts, and in the course of time the whole administration of Novgorod and the areas it controlled became elective. The resident prince was thus transformed into a mere figurehead whose chief duty was to lead the military forces of this city-state. Popular sovereignty was expressed in the city assembly made up of all free citizens of whatever rank, and since this body was able to signify its will only by acclamation and sometimes even by pitched battles, the executive functions were exercised by a council composed of the bishop and various high elected officials, whether active or retired. The outlying domains of Novgorod—for eventually the republic colonized the territory as far as the White Sea and the Kola peninsula—enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy, but always under the surveillance of a viceroy from the metropolis, though there are cases where citizens of these colonies participated in the city assembly at Novgorod itself. Pskov began its historical career as a dependency of Novgorod, but established its independence in 1347, when the men of Novgorod bound themselves by treaty not to send any viceroy to Pskov or to exercise any further judicial rights there.

The republican principle thrived in Novgorod and Pskov because actually the princes had contributed nothing to the civic and economic growth of these areas, which owed their expansion purely to the energy of their own citizens. But in northeastern Russia the situation was quite different. There, of the two dominant forces in contemporary society (the city assembly

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16



and the prince) only the prince remained, and became a landed proprietor who organized the economic activity of his subjects. If he shared his authority at all, it was not with the community but with other landed proprietors and with organs of the church to which he resigned judicial rights and the collection of dues. As early as the second half of the twelfth century, when immigration from the Kiev area to the northeastern principalities assumed large dimensions, Vladimir Monomach's grandson Prince Andrew already ruled as an autocrat in the domain of Suzdal and refused to recognize the rights either of nobles or of commoners as expressed in the town assemblies. This policy cost him his life, but after his assassination the older towns in this area were unable to maintain the principles of urban democracy even before the Tartar conquest wiped out this ideal. These towns were few in number, and the rural settlements were too scattered to acquire political cohesion. Later the onslaught of the Tartars so much impoverished even such towns as then existed that their pauperized inhabitants were more concerned about their daily bread than about political rights. Furthermore, the choice and confirmation of princes depended for the time being on the caprices of the invaders, so that this function, which had formerly belonged in practice to the city assembly, died out altogether, and when the assemblies occasionally convened, it was generally with the intention of rioting and revolting against Tartar exactions. The prince, ruling on Tartar sufferance, thus became the sole remaining possessor of local authority.

As we have seen, not until the middle of the fifteenth century was it absolutely clear that the nucleus of statehood in eastern Russia was definitely located at Moscow. By that time, the regional princes were permanently attached to their several domains which they ruled as feudal lords, supported by the contributions paid by the subjects who worked their lands, and there was no difference between minor and major princes in their proprietary attitude toward their landed possessions. Since their interests were thus predominantly economic, these

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16



princes began to develop a new group of aids who administered these interests, and such aids (who were actually officials, not nobles concerned with warfare) evolved into a new form of prince's council, or *duma*. The larger domains were split up into districts around important towns, and the districts into minor administrative divisions, all handled by appointees of the prince. These officials were far less concerned with the maintenance of public order or of civil rights than with seeing that the prince received his due financial return from the subject population, although church properties were usually exempt from their attentions. It is thus an open question whether there was any public law whatever in the early Muscovite period. In any event, the system shows the characteristic features of medieval feudalism: the dismemberment of state authority and its fusion with land ownership.

The rise of Moscow naturally produced a slow recovery from this parcellation, as the minor regional princes either voluntarily or under pressure surrendered their domains to the more powerful center. Novgorod was annexed outright by Ivan III after conquest had seriously diminished its outlying possessions. But especially during the last half of the fourteenth century, the gravitation toward Moscow moved with ever-increasing speed. On the other hand, the early Muscovite princes handled their new acquisitions purely as personal property. They bequeathed sections of it to their heirs, although soon it was the recognized practice to bequeath the lion's share to the oldest son. The logical conclusion from this tendency was first drawn by Ivan III after witnessing as a youth the vicissitudes of his father Basil II, who had almost lost the Muscovite domain because of feudal rivalries. Ivan refused to dismember his domain even in the interest of members of his family. His title of Great Prince (or Grand Duke) of all Rus he interpreted not merely in an honorific but in a juridical sense, and made it clear that he considered the whole domain as his personal patrimony. In this attitude he was confirmed less by pure selfishness than by the realization that only a unified state could

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16



175* 631 ●421 resist both the Tartars and Lithuania, though in his will he did not break entirely with tradition, but bequeathed to his eldest son two-thirds of his landed possessions. Even so, however, the remaining regional princes ceased to be a menace, and the fact that his younger son was bound to serve Basil III as his overlord made the latter "sovereign of all Rus" in fact as well as in name. Such few regional princes as still existed merely held estates with rights of judgment and tribute, and were factually subject to the prince of Moscow. The title of tsar was first used by Ivan III in 1484, and in 1502 his son, Basil II, added the title "autocrat" (*samoderzhets*).

175* Such is the political, economic, and ideological process by which the power of Kiev was dissipated and, despite the competition of Lithuania, what was once a mere hunting lodge of the princes of Suzdal and Vladimir became the nucleus around which the modern Russian state took shape. It would be idle to pretend that this ideal was not realized without abundant propaganda from the Orthodox clergy who, particularly after the fall of Constantinople, wished to see the Prince of Moscow the head of Orthodox Christianity and the heir of Rome. Under the pressure of this new tradition, Basil III in particular, as the son of a princess of Byzantium, adorned his court with new ceremonial and assumed the device of the doubleheaded eagle which had belonged to his Byzantine forebears.

175* 643 Thus the personal rule which had its origins in the decline of republican usages in northeastern Russia both before and since the Tartar conquest evolved into an absolutism founded upon dynastic tradition and supported by a nationalistic legend propagated by the church. The Muscovite tsar was not only the owner of his domain; he was God's anointed whom his subjects could approach only with fear and awe. The tsar's will was the will of God. As the heir of the Byzantine emperors, he acquired new authority over the church as the defender of the Orthodox faith. He confirmed the appointment of metropolitans and archbishops, even sometimes naming them without calling church councils, and clerics referred their disputes